

LETTER

(MS. 1162)

MS. 42

To the Right Hon.

The EARL of TEMPLE,

ON THE

Subject of the Forty-fifth Number of
the NORTH-BRITON;

AND ON HIS

Patronage of the supposed AUTHOR of it.

Qui facit per alterum, facit per se.

LAW MAXIM.

*Carum esse civem, bene de republica mereri, laudari, coli,
diligere, gloriosum est: metui vero, et in odio esse, invidio-
sum, detestabile, imbecillum, Caducum.*

INSCRIPTION ON the TEMPLE of Ancient
VIRTUE in the Gardens of STOW.

L O N D O N:

Printed in the Year M,DCC,LXIII.

[Price six-pence.]



RB.236.1054

L E T T E R

To the Right Hon.

The Earl of Temple

ON THE

Subject of the proposed
the North-British

AND ON HIS

Patronage of the proposed

of the proposed

of the proposed

of the proposed

L O N D O N

Printed in the Year 1794
[Price 1s. 6d.]



L E T T E R

To the Right Hon.

The Earl of T E M P L E.

My Lord,

Notwithstanding Mr. Wilkes has been considered by the ministry as the author of the 45th number of the North Briton, the zeal which on that account you have manifested in his favour too evidently evinces your public avowal and approbation of the contents thereof to admit the least doubt that your and his sentiments are the same on that subject. For this reason, my Lord, I shall not apologize for the liberty I take of addressing you in the following pages. I shall endeavour to convince yourself, at least all those whom passion and prejudice have not totally blinded and irreclaimably misled, that your late proceedings are irreconcilable with that character which should ever accompany the rank of nobility; that the writings of the North Briton are contaminated with malevolence, misrepresentation and fallacy; and tend to excite commotions in the state, which are not only derogatory of the behaviour of a good subject, but of human nature. The first paragraph of this unparalleled North Briton declares, "the King's Speech has always been considered by the legislature, and by the public at large, as the speech of the minister." This is indeed a round assertion; but by what argument is it supported? When both houses of parliament address their sovereigns on their speeches from the throne, do they consider these addresses as presented to the minister? If they do not, with what truth has it been asserted that the King's Speech has been always considered by them as that of

the minister? Do even those who consider those speeches as composed by the administration, conceive they are not approved, or not understood by the sovereign who delivers them; or that he can be induced by any minister to deliver as his own, what he neither approves nor understands? And yet something of this kind must be the secret opinion, whatever may be the open avowal of the author of the above North Briton, whom you countenance. Will it not then, my lord, be difficult to explain in what manner that insolence, which he affects to have offered to the minister, can be distinct from offering it to the king? Whoever then, my lord, may be the composer of those speeches which are delivered from the throne, does not his majesty by pronouncing them therefrom make them his own? Wherefore, with whatever artifice it may be attempted to throw the imaginary culpability of the contents thereof on the minister, must it not rest upon the king? And the indecency and ill manners which are contained in such attempts, are they not an insult on majesty itself?

Such being the true state of the first paragraph, my lord, I will now proceed to shew, in what an illiberal manner his majesty has been treated by the North Briton. The author of it proceeds to say, "this week has given the public the most abandoned instance of ministerial effrontery ever attempted to be imposed on mankind." Such my lord if my reasoning be right, is the imputation of the North Briton to his sovereign, though he has affected to place it to the account of the minister, and such, I fear, which you have adopted as your own by publicly espousing the author of it.

Before I proceed, my lord, to enquire into the reasons for such slanderous assertions; to develop the falsehoods which they include; and to prove that they contain no single instance of abandoned effrontery; permit me to ask you a few questions concerning the subsequent parts of the same paragraph, which says, "I am in doubt whether the imposition is greater on the sovereign, or on the nation. Every friend of his country must lament that a prince of so many great and

" amiable qualities, whom England truly reveres, can
 " be brought to give the sanction of his sacred name
 " to the most odious measures, and to the most in-
 " justifiable public declarations from a throne ever
 " renowned for truth, honour, and unsullied virtue."
 And pray, my lord, did you well consider the glaring
 contradictions in the parts of this extract, before you a-
 dopted the author of them? Can a prince, my lord,
 endowed with *great* and *amiable* qualities be brought to
 pronounce the most abandoned instance of effrontery?
 And if, as the North Briton declares, he has been indu-
 ced to pronounce it, can you conceive him to be the
great the *amiable* person he affects to describe him? If
 you believe his majesty possesses those great and amiable
 qualities, is it possible, you can believe he has delivered
 an abandoned instance of effrontery from the throne?
 And if you believe, that what he spoke on that occasion
 is that abandoned instance which the North Briton deems
 it, is it possible, you can believe the king can enjoy those
 great and amiable qualities? You, my lord, or your
 North Briton must reconcile these incompatible circum-
 stances, or leave the world to embrace their own opi-
 nions on that subject, which probably may be different
 from yours. However, my lord, though such recon-
 cilement is beyond my powers I am willing to exert, for
 myself alone, the utmost stretch of implicit faith, and to
 agree that you may possibly have believed, or did not
 discern the contradictions above mentioned; and then,
 my lord, I would ask you what opinion the nation must
 conceive of that intellect, which cannot discover such
 palpable absurdities; and what attention ought to be
 paid to measures which are adopted by the possessor of
 it? And if you did discern them, how will you vindicate
 your rank and honour from the imputation which every
 honest man must fix upon your lordship for thus public-
 ly avowing them?

I hope, my lord, it is true that England does revere
 his majesty. I am sure he deserves it: but I cannot be
 induced to believe that your lordship and the North
 Briton revere him. Is it possible that such indignant
 treatment can be offered to the person whom men re-
 vere? The world, at least that part of it not yet run

mad, believes that the above calumny has been spread in order to efface that reverence which the subjects of England ought to cherish for a prince of qualities so great and amiable.

It is in vain that men affect, on such occasions, to screen themselves from imputations of disloyalty, by a pretended veneration for their prince; or by laying the most atrocious accusations on the minister in words, to imagine they escape the criminality of facts which throw them on their sovereign; since it is more certain that his majesty pronounced the speech, than that the minister composed it. There are none so perfectly deluded who do not perceive that the culpability which the North Briton would compel that speech to contain, though it scar the minister, must wound his master; like the arrow of Sir Walter Tyrrel, which though levelled at the hart, was lodged within the bosom of the king.

Having advanced thus far, my lord, let me now consider on what this hardy assertion of abandoned effrontery is founded. It is on these words of his majesty's "my expectations have been fully answered by the happy effects which the several allies of my crown have derived from this salutary measure of the definitive treaty. The powers at war with my good brother, the king of Prussia, have been induced to agree to such terms of accommodation, as that great prince has approved, and the success which has attended my negotiation, has necessarily and immediately diffused the blessings of peace through every part of Europe."

Certainly, my lord, there is no instance of abandoned effrontery in his majesty's declaring his expectations are fully answered by the happy effects which the several allies of his crown have derived from this salutary measure of the definitive treaty. If you still conceive, that it contains that instance; you must believe the author must have known that the sentiments of his sovereign belied his words, and that he pronounced with his lips what his heart disapproved: a sentiment neither honourable to your prince nor to the dignity of an earldom. But it is of little advantage to your cause what you may

think on this head: since your favourite North Briton has asserted " that the King of Prussia did not barely " approve but absolutely dictated as conqueror every " article of the terms of peace." Will you then my lord support a man who so preposterously insinuates that his majesty's expectations were not fully answered by that power in the King of Prussia of dictating the terms of peace? Or can it be denied that the powers at war have been induced to agree to such terms of accommodation as that great prince has approved? Unless indeed you believe that the King of Prussia has dictated such terms as he did not approve; and that his majesty by withdrawing the King of France from assisting the Empress Queen has not contributed to the Prussian prince's, dictating these very terms of peace. With what truth can it be denied that the success which attended his majesty's negotiation has necessarily and immediately diffused the blessings of peace through every part of Europe? Since the King of Prussia, finding the English administration would be no longer duped to support him by subsidies, has instantly agreed to terms of pacification. Though his majesty has chosen to express himself in terms more consentaneous to the complacent dispositions of his heart, than your fastidious archtype would have selected; are not the consequences of the definitive treaty the *same* which the insolent North Briton has asserted to be *different* from the meaning of the speech from the throne?

Where then is the infamous fallacy of the above expressions, which has been imputed to his majesty? And with what propriety can it be pronounced, that no advantage has accrued to the king of Prussia from our sovereign's negotiation. Were these assertions grounded on declarations from the Prussian prince, is it not an insolence to believe him in preference to your lawful sovereign? There was a time when the authority of the former would have weighed but little in the scale of England; and no sovereign has given less cause for distrust his truth and honour than the present who fills the throne of these realms. But when the veracity of his majesty's declaration is evinced by the incontrovertible evidence of facts, what ought we to think of you,

who can so notoriously espouse the cause of that man who has so audaciously asserted the contrary?

On what "terms of friendship the king of Prussia was "at this court," I do not presume to know, my lord; but that he was "betrayed in the treaty of peace," is an absolute contradiction to what your favourite North Briton asserts, and you adopt. It is impossible for a sovereign, so betrayed, could have "dictated the terms of "peace as conqueror;" or, as the North Briton declares, "that he would have stipulated security for the "elector of Hanover." It is not the characteristic of the Prussian monarch to return good for evil, or to seek the advantage of those who have betrayed him; and I must prefer the testimony of his general character to the assertions of the North Briton and the sentiments of your lordship. But, my lord, were none of these reasons to be adduced, I should postpone all belief of what the former can declare, to the single circumstance of his majesty's acknowledged character; a prince who is as incapable of treachery to his allies, as your favourite is of exhibiting acts of candour; when ambition, in the hands of you and your brother-in-law, is goading him on to deeds which posterity will behold with horror.

I defy him to exhibit the least act of treachery in our present sovereign, unless, peradventure, he should denominate the disinclination to renew the subsidiary treaty, which your said brother at first so invectively condemned, and then so presumptuously renewed; that treaty which hath proved so expensive and so useless to the nation; that treaty so consentaneous to his and your recreant pursuits in Germany, an act of treachery: if such conduct be to betray an ally, to save the treasure of England is treachery also, in his opinion; a treachery which you would have done well to have adopted.

Your favourite, my lord, continues to assert, "that "the preliminary articles of peace have drawn the "tempt of mankind on our wretched negotiators." Not of all mankind, permit me to say. The two houses of the legislator, in the upper of which you were ne-

ver deemed the wisest member, though your hendecasyllable brother has been thought the most loquacious of the lower, have approved and applauded this peace. The seats of learning, one of which your North Briton has egregiously abused, have, from conviction of its blessing, followed their example; as well as the city of London, and many other parts of this realm. Are you, my lord, and your minion, more learned and more wise than those august assemblies? He must write, and you must patronize, a different kind of literature, before the world will be induced to offer that sacrifice, of believing it, to your vanity.

From what part of mankind has this contempt been drawn? From such, my lord, whose inordinate ambition, like that of your lordship, has seduced them to declare, that they will no longer remain in the ministry than they can despotically rule the sovereign and his subjects. From men whose antipatriotic avarice, by iniquitous contracts and remittances, has been devouring the vitals of their country. From men whose remorseless prostitution has been trading, to the nation's ruin, in 'Change-Alley. From all who delight in blood, and expect advantage from the effusion of it. Who see, with infinite delight, their fellow-subjects slain, their prosperity mortgaged, and the manufactories of the realm oppressed with endless taxes.

What a strain of malevolence, my lord, appears in returning to the preliminaries of peace, in order to reprehend a minister for that which your favourite has allowed to have been rectified in the definitive treaty! Yet, my lord, in what manner can that original mistake be with justice applied to him, since the most proper precaution was taken, by applying to the East India company, who ought to have been best acquainted with that subject? That body is solely responsible for that error, of which the North Briton accuses the then minister; and since he acknowledges it to have been remedied, how is the nation injured, or lord Bute to be reasonably blamed? Is it not amazing, my lord, into what inadvertences, and self-condemnation, malice can impel her votaries

who can so notoriously espouse the cause of that man who has so audaciously asserted the contrary?

On what "terms of friendship the king of Prussia was "at this court," I do not presume to know, my lord; but that he was "betrayed in the treaty of peace," is an absolute contradiction to what your favourite North Briton asserts, and you adopt. It is impossible for a sovereign, so betrayed, could have "dictated the terms of "peace as conqueror;" or, as the North Briton declares, "that he would have stipulated security for the "elector of Hanover." It is not the characteristic of the Prussian monarch to return good for evil, or to seek the advantage of those who have betrayed him; and I must prefer the testimony of his general character to the assertions of the North Briton and the sentiments of your lordship. But, my lord, were none of these reasons to be adduced, I should postpone all belief of what the former can declare, to the single circumstance of his majesty's acknowledged character; a prince who is as incapable of treachery to his allies, as your favourite is of exhibiting acts of candour; when ambition, in the hands of you and your brother-in-law, is goading him on to deeds which posterity will behold with horror.

I defy him to exhibit the least act of treachery in our present sovereign, unless, peradventure, he should denominate the disinclination to renew the subsidiary treaty, which your said brother at first so invectively condemned, and then so presumptuously renewed; that treaty which hath proved so expensive and so useless to the nation; that treaty so consentaneous to his and your recreant pursuits in Germany, an act of treachery: if such conduct be to betray an ally, to save the treasure of England is treachery also, in his opinion; a treachery which you would have done well to have adopted.

Your favourite, my lord, continues to assert, "that "the preliminary articles of peace have drawn the contempt of mankind on our wretched negociators." Not of all mankind, permit me to say. The two houses of the legislator, in the upper of which you were ne-

ver deemed the wisest member, though your hendecasyllable brother has been thought the most loquacious of the lower, have approved and applauded this peace. The seats of learning, one of which your North Briton has egregiously abused, have, from conviction of its blessing, followed their example; as well as the city of London, and many other parts of this realm. Are you, my lord, and your minion, more learned and more wise than those august assemblies? He must write, and you must patronize, a different kind of literature, before the world will be induced to offer that sacrifice, of believing it, to your vanity.

From what part of mankind has this contempt been drawn? From such, my lord, whose inordinate ambition, like that of your lordship, has seduced them to declare, that they will no longer remain in the ministry than they can despotically rule the sovereign and his subjects. From men whose antipatriotic avarice, by iniquitous contracts and remittances, has been devouring the vitals of their country. From men whose remorseless prostitution has been trading, to the nation's ruin, in 'Change-Alley. From all who delight in blood, and expect advantage from the effusion of it. Who see, with infinite delight, their fellow-subjects slain, their prosperity mortgaged, and the manufactories of the realm oppressed with endless taxes.

What a strain of malevolence, my lord, appears in returning to the preliminaries of peace, in order to reprehend a minister for that which your favourite has allowed to have been rectified in the definitive treaty! Yet, my lord, in what manner can that original mistake be with justice applied to him, since the most proper precaution was taken, by applying to the East India company, who ought to have been best acquainted with that subject? That body is solely responsible for that error, of which the North Briton accuses the then minister; and since he acknowledges it to have been remedied, how is the nation injured, or lord Bute to be reasonably blamed? Is it not amazing, my lord, into what inadvertences, and self-condemnation, malice can impel her votaries

"The most valuable conquests," my Lord, which your minion has said are restored, are they essentially different from those which your step-brother and yourself had agreed to restore? I am sure the difference is in favour of those who made the peace, notwithstanding we had a new ally to protect, and a new enemy to oppose; and all men saw, that though the necessary supplies in money might be raised, that the interest of that loan must speedily suppress our commerce by excess of taxes; and that the recruiting our land and naval armaments must suspend our manufactures, and tilling of the soil, by the loss of those labouring subjects, which war devours.

But mad ambition, intoxicated by successes due to the caprice of fortune, the blunders of our enemy, and the bravery of our forces, which disdained to govern less than the king and kingdom, feels no remorse in wantonly wasting the blood and treasure of our fellow-subjects, to feed her insatiable appetite. She repines at the mercy of that prince, who saved millions of money, and perhaps of lives, by restoring peace, according to the dictates of his God and of sound policy.

It is not difficult, my lord, to interpret the insinuation which your friend and favourite has given concerning "the debt on the civil list, and the application of that money towards procuring an intire approbation of Parliament, concerning the peace." It is easily understood, and that the same abandoned effrontery is meant to be thrown on the whole legislative body which has been imputed to his majesty; and that the cause of this debt was owing to the price of their corruption: an insinuation unjust and injurious since "the world must know" that many of both houses, who voted therein on that occasion, are not to be corrupted, as far as it hitherto appears from the whole tenour of their lives. Nor does injury and injustice alone, even self condemnation attends that sarcastic insinuation. Is it not amazing, my lord, that a man, who, publicly in print, professes himself the friend of Whigs, should have the hardiness of suggesting the crime of corruption to any men, when

his avowed friends and favourites, for many preceeding reigns, have scarcely used another instrument of governing, save that of misrepresentation?

The labour of your favourite, my lord, to pervert every circumstance to his and your preposterous purposes, is egregiously malicious. He says, "the proud and feeble Spaniard does not renounce, but only desists from all pretensions which he may have formed on the right of fishing about Newfoundland." With what a slender train he endeavours to set fire to the minds of the people; and like Guay Fawkes, to blow the nation into confusion and ruin by his explosive malevolence, rather than live in peace beneath the reign of him whom you have called the best of princes.

Permit me, my lord, to assert, that this distinction of *renounce* from *desist* is not only iniquitously but foolishly made and that the whole is unfairly represented. As to the latter part, your darling has disingenuously neglected to mention, that the king of Spain has engaged for his posterity as well as for himself. And as to the former, do you imagine that had the letters in the word *renounce* been inserted in the treaty, that they would have obliged the Spaniard, on a future rupture between England and that potentate to behave with more observance of his stipulations than those in the word *desist*. If the Spaniard *desists*, what does it avail whether he *renounces* or not? and if he *renounces* and does not *desist*, how would England have been advantaged, or the Spaniard bound, by one word more than the other? At a moment, my lord, when I am surveying the happy expression of your physiognomy and figure, and contemplating the profound wisdom of your conduct in adopting this distinguishing favourite, I am with difficulty induced to think that you do not discern the *fallacy* of this representation of the above affair. I will not place the epithet of *infamous* before it, let that be consecrated to the abuse of his sovereign by the loyal author of the decent North Briton.

Having in this manner, my lord, considered your minion's misrepresentation and Calumny on that part of

his Majesty's speech relative to the peace, I proceed to lay before your discernment, the subsequent passage, in which he attacks the expression of "*oeconomy*, which is recommended to the consideration of parliament? Let us, my lord, imagine that no instance of *oeconomy* can be given but "in the king's household;" may it not be inferred from thence, that his Majesty has shewn in that, what he wishes to have followed by the state; and if it has not been hitherto observed with all the rigour which good subjects and the king desire, his Majesty has now recommended it to the care of the legislature in order for its promotion, and to manifest his approbation thereof. But, my lord, such censures in the neglect of *oeconomy* are adopted with an ill grace, by you, who instead of reducing our late and numerous army to its present state, would have preserved it at a much higher, and thereby have inflamed the annual expences of the kingdom. This *oeconomy* then, which is thus censured, is greater than that which you and your brother Pitt would have adopted; if regard is to be paid to the speeches of a man, who thro' life has been engaged in contracting and approving the same measures in abusing and applauding the same king in condemning and supporting the same ministers.

But, my lord, with what grace can you impute the crime of inattention to national *oeconomy* to other ministers who yourself have been so inattentive thereto? Cast your eyes on Sir Lawrence Dundas, on Mr. Oswald, on Mr. Taylor, all whose contracts were made under your and Mr. Pitt's administration, and you will find that, by your inattention to *oeconomy*, these three have acquired not much less than a million and a half of money; and were I acquainted with the names of other men in similar stations, to what an enormous sum might the produce of this neglect *oeconomy* amount.

I say not this, my lord, with any view of reprehending the behaviour of the above gentlemen on that head; they have received and not granted such lucrative contracts: and the manners of the present times would decide any instance of renouncing self interest for that of

their country. I am credibly informed that each of them has discharged his duty with laudable care, and they are so far deservedly intitled to the approbation of the public.

The two first of these, my lord, are the natives of Scotland. Oh! what a malignant exclamation of abuse we should have heard sounded from the brazen lungs of the North Briton, had such contracts been transacted during the administration of that nobleman whom he calls "the Scottish prime minister of England!" what accusation of partiality! what scandal would have issued from that exuberant fountain of malediction! Yourself, my lord, and your candid friend who are as mute as fish on the above subject, would have been as loud as thunder, had it happened under the ministry of Lord Bute. He would have been execrated for those deeds, for which Mr. Pitt feels not the lightest breath of reprehension. Believe me my lord, such flagrant partiality is illiberal and disgraces human nature, when profusion passes uncensured in one man, and even oeconomy compared therewith, is imputed as the most atrocious neglect of public money to another.

Your favourite, my lord, having advanced thus far, "asks, "if a regiment which was completed as to its complement of officers on the Tuesday, and broke on Thursday, is a proof of oeconomy? To which I answer, that neither the administration of yourself and brother Pitt, nor of any other Minister, can afford a more convincing proof of national oeconomy. This regiment was raising, whilst the uncertainty of peace made it necessary to prepare for war; and it was broken the moment the returning footsteps of tranquility made it practicable to save the expence of supporting it. Can it be ignorance, my lord, in the North Briton, which has induced him to urge this as an instance of profusion, or in your lordship to abet it? To what motive then shall it be imputed? To that reverence for candour, which is so similar to that sensation which you entertain for his majesty.

The preceding question having been discussed in the above manner, I proceed to that which follows in your favourite North Briton. He asks, " is the pay of the Scottish master Elliot to be voted by an English parliament " under the head of œconomy." To this I must reply that yourself and your author must be convinced that since the union, no such assembly as an English parliament can exist. The names of English and Scottish are lost in that of British, and the denominating of it English, is malevolent and inflammatory, designed to sting the minds of the people to outrage, who see not the serpent which lurks beneath this flowery pretension of superior love of England. But happily, my lord, for this country, however it may appear to your eyes, like the most venomous of all reptiles, your favourite writer has prevented the perfect execution of his design, and alarmed the nation against the danger of his poison, by the loudness which has attended the shaking of his rattles. The bestowing the post of captain on that boy at this time, is a circumstance which I shall not attempt to justify. And yet there was a time when a whig minister, to whom the North Briton is so much a friend, presented the post of coronet of horse to a female infant, on the day in which he stood sponsor to her at the font, and not a thousandth part of the clamour succeeded thereto, which has been excited on this account. To have made the latter a proper person for that post, her sex must have been metamorphosed; time would have effected it in the former, or have removed the cause of the censure. But permit me to say, my lord, tho' I dislike the giving this post of captain to a boy, I revere the king who strip'd it from him. The moment his majesty was informed he disapproved the proceeding, and instantly reduc'd him to an half pay Ensign. Did your author and yourself, my lord, revere the great and amiable qualities of his majesty, as you profess you would have done his sacred character justice, by having this conspicuous mark of it inserted in those papers which you are said to revise and kown to countenance.

What a clamour my lord, has been made concerning this master Elliot, as if the constitution of the realm

were subverting, by the bestowing a captain's commission on a boy; and which was recalled the moment it was known by him, who alone has right to give and to recall. Whereas your brother Pitt, inobservant of that act which gave the crown to the present family which you affect to reverence: that act which says, "that no person born out of the kingdoms of England, Scotland or Ireland, or the dominions thereto belonging, although he be naturalized or made a denizen (except such as are born of English parents) shall be capable to enjoy any office or place of trust either civil or military" That brother Pitt, when minister, bestowed the post of general of the British army, on prince Ferdinand in Germany, in direct opposition to the express words of that act. How far the inroad committed on that sacred compact, concluded between the king and people, in the reign of king William is cognizable by law, I shall not presume to say; but this I know, that whatever may be thought of that affair, he who shall dare to write or to print any thing in derogation of that act of settlement is guilty of high treason; and that many ministers of these Realms have anciently been impeached for the commission of things less criminal.

The next imputation of criminality in the North Briton is, "the breaking the staff of so brave an officer as marshal Ligonier, which is represented as an indignity done to him; and giving the whole power of the army to the crown, that is to the minister, to be bestowed only on the creatures of the Scottish faction." I appeal, my lord, to every officer in the army, whether during your brother Pitt's reign, the power of Lord Ligonier was not equally feeble as at present, and whether the minister did not at that time assume the same power which can be had now that general is discharged from the head of the army? But no possible opportunity of perverting the truth of things is to be omitted, in order to incense an inconsiderate multitude. Was it not reasonable that your author should have tarried to see the event of lord Bates resignation, before he asserted that military preferments will henceforth be bestowed only on the creatures of the Scottish faction? An assertion, my lord, which can be justified on no other principle

than that of divination, and tho' your favourite is certainly blessed with the benefit of seeing two ways at the same time a qualification which entitles him in part to that praise which you bestow on him as an officer, as it enables him to see by more ways than one, thro' which an enemy may be advancing; yet I doubt whether this double entitles him to the second sight or gift of prophecy. A quality, which if he enjoys, ought to be little relied on in the predictions of futurity, from a man who misrepresents the state of known and present facts. But pray, my lord, who are "these tools of lord Bute's power, who are to pursue the same odious measures?" If he means the secretaries of state, their established characters will vindicate them from the illiberal aspersion of being the tools of any man. The same spirit which animated the father of lord Egremont to the welfare of his native land, still actuates his son: a spirit which was never known to bend before the promoter of base purposes; or to be directed by any motive but that of patriotism and truth. Lord Halifax has given such incontrovertible proofs of his attachment to the good of that country over which he presided as his majesty's representative, that no time can erase them from the minds of its grateful subjects. And it would be absurd to imagine he will be less devoted to the welfare of his native land. He has convinced the world, of his talents to govern immediately beneath the crown, of his superiority to pecuniary influence; and of the impracticability of his being dictated to by other men, to a degree so conspicuous, that it would be ridiculous to conceive he can be the pliable observer of sinister council from any man, or be less in power than that which his post imparts to him. Ask the Irish, why they hung on his chariot wheels and implored his return to complete the blessings which he had begun to spread amongst them? Will the English therefore listen to the slanderous assertions of the North Briton, or desire to see that noble Earl removed from power, and to defeat their own happiness; The first lord of the treasury is, my lord, your brother; he does that honour to your family which I wish was to be found in every other branch of it. He, my lord, by renouncing the views of you and your brother Pitt, and by ad-

hering to his sovereign, has demonstrated that he little apt to follow the precepts of faction. He, my lord, prefers the duties of allegiance to the calls of ambition; he chuses to be the servant and not the sovereign, of his king and resigning to the cause of justice the ties of consanguinity and of affinity, unites in his administration the service of his master with that of his country.

And now, my lord, your dispassionate favourite pronouncing the guilt of lord Bute bursts into imprecation, "that he may never find indemnity from an injured nation, that the negociations of the late inglorious peace and the excise may haunt him wherever he goes, and the terrors of the just resentment which he must be in to meet from a brave and insulted people." If the peace be inglorious which his Majesty has made, what would that have been which your brother Pitt would have concluded? But, my lord, the author of this peace will be blessed by posterity, when that of the oppressive taxes which have been imposed by this ruinous war, and extravagant profusion of treasure shall be remembered with detestation. If the placing an excise on cyder, the most defensible of all those taxes which have been laid since the commencement of hostilities is to haunt lord Bute, what ought that on beer to do to your excising brother? and tho' my lord, some exceptions may be made to some minute particulars of the cyder act, shew me that reason which can bear examination, why the people in the cyder counties should drink their common liquor at less expence than those who drink beer? And wherefore, one part of his majesty's subjects should be at ease from a duty which the others are obliged to pay, unless they can plead the privilege of parliament, and like your author of the North Briton, be exempted from the laws which honest subjects are obliged to obey. Yet what tumult, what roaring for liberty has this impost raised; as if excise had been unknown before in this nation, or never extended since its first institution. It is, my lord to your brother Pitt the people are indebted for the extension of the excise on malt and beer; in justice to the duke of Newcastle and to Mr. Legge, it ought to be made known that the interests of the loan for which

the latter was mortgaged, was by them intended to be aid on sugar, and that your brother Pit, who treats his superiors in that fastidious manner, with which no man before him hath ever treated his equals, peremptorily insisted that it should be laid on beer, or that he would resign: the interest of the Creol prevailed over that of honest and industrious Englishman. And whilst your favourite has been heating the imaginations of the people to believe that brother little less than their saviour, you, my lord, must be convinced that to him they are indebted for that increase of a seventh part of their toil and labour, in order to acquire the price of that liquor, which is so necessary to support them therein. Such are the different fates of men in power, he passed uncentured for that oppressive tax on beer, whilst lord Bute has been industriously made the object of popular resentment, and of malicious pursuit for that on cyder: an impost which justice demands and reason sanctifies.

The next paragraph of this singular paper informs us, my lord, "that in vain will such a minister, or the foul dregs of his power, the tools of corruption and despotism preach up in the speech, that spirit of concord and that obedience to the laws which is essential to good order." In this passage, my lord, your North Briton seems to have ran beside the post, even though we should with him suppose, "the king's speech to be that of the minister;" the preaching up this speech, be it whose it may, must certainly belong to him who speaks it; and if that inference be just, has not your favourite made even his majesty one part of the earl of Bute's foul dregs of power and tools of corruption and despotism? How diligently he adheres to that reverence, which he professes to entertain for his sovereign? did you remark this instance of it, my lord, when you attended your favourite in the courts of justice?

He now pronounces that they have sent the spirit of discord through the land, and he will prophecy "that it will never be extinguished but by the extension of their power." You and I, my lord, are convinced that his misrepresentations and calumnies have sent the

spirit of discord thro' the land, notwithstanding we differ so essentially in our conduct thereupon; and I verily believe him a false prophet, and that the power of his Majesty whom he literally ranks among the foul dregs and tools of corruption, will never be extinguish'd but by the course of nature; and that the extension of it would not restore the spirit of concord to the land. Who are they, my lord, whom the North Briton would place in the room of those noblemen and gentlemen who are in the administration since lord Bute has resigned? I will save you the answer. They are your lordship and brother Pitt, who in the letter to a citizen of London, have declared that you will no longer remain in the ministry, than you can absolutely dictate and direct the measures of the state, even in opposition to the king and the privy council. For surely, you will not deny that had his majesty been of your opinion you had contemned the advice of his council. Will the spirit of concord be sent forth by enthralling the king and his subjects; are the English reduced implicitly to obey ministerial despotism, unknown before, and remain unanimous beneath it? I trust, my lord, the North Briton is mistaken.

However, my lord, tho' the spirit of concord is not gone forth, your author declares "the spirit of liberty has" of which this paper of the North Briton is an illustrious instance, "and a noble opposition has been given to the "wicked instruments of oppression." By this noble opposition, I presume he means the opposition of your lordship's nobility; otherwise it would be difficult to understand him. Certainly, my lord, there is nothing truly noble in imputing abandoned effrontery, and infamous fallacy to the king upon the throne; and I fancy you yourself will hardly avow it in the house of lords. Should not then the spirit of liberty in the above part be changed to that of licentiousness; and the noble opposition to wicked instruments, to an ignoble attack on majesty itself. As to the real wicked instruments of oppression, I have already said enough concerning them, and the events of time, I fear will still verify what has been delivered thereon.

In what manner, my lord, would you spread the spirit of liberty, who refused all power that was short of enthralling the king himself! How have you contributed to lend forth a noble opposition to the wicked instruments of oppression, who by having squandered such immense sums of *english* money on *alien* interests, have loaded the subjects of this state with the *oppressive* weight of eighty millions, which are added to the former debt? Is not this very excise, against which your favourite so vehemently inveighs the natural offspring of your and your brother Pitt's extravagance of the public money?

What minister can be more despotic than he who will know no equal even in his sovereign? Can we believe your favourite, my lord, whose endeavours are so flagitiously exerted, to restore such men to power, when he declares, "that he wishes as much as any man in the kingdom to see the honour of the crown maintained in a manner truly becoming royalty." What can so effectually disgrace the honour of the crown, as to see a sovereign resign it into the hands of a servant, who has publicly declared, that he will be his master, or not in office? Then, my lord, every honest man, "will lament to see it sunk even to prostitution," as the North Briton affects to lament at present.

The succeeding sentence, my lord, is not less singular than the preceding: "What a shame, says the North Briton, was it to see the security of this country in point of military force, complimented away contrary to the opinion of royalty itself, and sacrificed to the prejudice and to the ignorance of a set of people, the most unfit from every consideration to be consulted on a matter relative to the security of the house of Hanover." By this my lord, I imagine your favourite should be understood to mean the reduction of the army below the first design, and that it was done at the instance of the tories. My lord, it is the first time that a free state has been supposed to have lost its security by reducing the influence of a standing army. Or that men who have been the cause of it, have been slander'd with prejudice and ignorance. After the propagation of opinions so absurd, shall we hear the name of Wilkes

and Liberty any more united. But perhaps, if I may draw an inference from the tenour of this whole paper, that he means to insinuate, by its being contrary to the "opinion of royalty itself," That the king was for preserving an enormous force, in order to suggest suspicions and distrust against his majesty; such contradictory designs are common with your favourite. The house of Hanover, my lord, is not less secure in this than in preceeding reigns. I will venture to say, its security is improved by the stronger attachment of those men thereto, whom the North Briton has defamed, whose principles will never permit them to desert, nor to maltreat his present majesty, whom they love: and from an invidious consciousness of that truth arises the malediction which that writer hath so liberally poured forth against them.

Notwithstanding the oppressive effects of your ministerial extravagance, notwithstanding the insidious publication of your favourite in order to sow dissention and jealousy, and to depreciate the character of his sovereign: in his subjects eyes, notwithstanding this cry of liberty, which the North Briton utters, as the Hyæna imitates the human voice, in order to delude and to devour; his majesty confided in the allegiance of his people, and rejoiced to see the army lessened, and the expence alleviated on his faithful subjects. He listened to the voice of reason, and was convinced, that such measures were dictated neither by prejudice nor ignorance, and that those who proposed that conduct were friends to liberty and to royalty. For the Tories, my lord, will for ever glory in supporting that constitutional union: and for the sake of continuing freedom to the nation, exert themselves to sustain the prerogatives of the crown against the rapacious attacks of tyrannous aristocrats, who have long held their princes and fellow subjects in abject submission.

There was a time, when your lordship declared, that if Mr. Pitt was enabled to do his country service it would be owing to the union of these Tories with your measures. Why are your sentiments so changed respecting

them? Why does your favourite so luxuriantly abuse these men, and even why did you yourself, if you are the author of that letter in the North Briton from the Pretender to lord Bute: your caustic brother too has virulently declaimed against them; he thinks it more safe to be an orator than an author; his printed publications have in a great measure effaced the influence of his oral. He has said, that he never joined them, but they him. Wonderful distinction! as if two things could be joined, and one of them not joined. Did not he and you receive them with open arms? Did you not receive them on terms of never deviating from your opposition to Germanic measures? And yet you are enraged against them, that after such flagrant breach of promise in you, they have forsaken the cause of such imperious and such futile men, and adhered to their sovereign whom they love and are determined to support. It is, my lord, the invariable characteristic of you, the shadow of your step brother, as the North Briton is of yourself, the shadow of a shade, to adopt and to renounce all men and all measures, to expose and to applaud the sovereign on the throne, to decry and to approve all ministers as you are in or out of place: and your vindictive pursuits arise, because you are not recalled to those posts of trust and power, which you so fastidiously resigned. To what is royalty reduced, if it must be thus injuriously treated for not recalling those to power, who resigned, because it was to be less than arbitrary!

No disapprobation, my lord, of the North Briton's pursuits shall, I trust, induce me to deviate from truth, or from doing him justice, even in the examination of this very paper. The following passage shall exhibit a proof of my impartiality and justice. In this he declares, "I wish to see the honour of the crown *religiously* asserted with regard to our allies." No man, my lord, can refuse his consent to believe the North Briton's good wishes of success to all things to which the term *religious* may be adjoined. Every day and hour's conversation and behaviour of him evince that truth: and where men are not happy enough to hear it from his lips, they may find it exemplified in the pious life of David king

of Israel, written by that religious gentleman. Yet, my lord, there was no occasion for him to have observed such decency in that work. Blasphemy and scandal, the abuse of God and of the king, are amongst the privileges of parliament; and he, whose duty it is to institute laws to prevent both, is protected from the penalty of transgressing these, and many more. Wherefore, to his piety alone his religious observation of decorum, in that instance, must be solely ascribed.

The next particular, in the North Briton, is no less extraordinary than the former. The writer of it asks, "Is it possible such an indignity can have happened, such a sacrifice of the honour of the crown of England, as that a minister should already have kissed his majesty's hand on being appointed to the most insolent and ungrateful court in the world, without a previous assurance of that reciprocal nomination which the meanest court in Europe would insist upon, before the proceeded to an act otherwise so derogatory to her honour?" In this place, my lord, your favourite should have proved, that no previous assurance of reciprocal nomination had been made, since on that alone he would seem to found the indignity and sacrifice of the crown of England; and yet, great as this indignity and this sacrifice may seem in his opinion, I can mention such as infinitely exceed them. What think you of the indignity and sacrifice of the crown of England, when the expedition to Rochefort was made to yield to the convention of Closter-Seven? What think you of them, when that convention was infracted through menaces from the king of Prussia? Whatever may be the greatness of those which he mentions, they have cost the nation neither blood nor treasure; whereas the latter have proved the expence of millions, and the ridicule of half the courts in Europe.

It is not the act, my lord, but the ambassador: it is not the glory of the crown, but the detestation of the minister who has resigned, and of those who now preside, that have inflamed your favourite to write, and you to support such indignities in him. Lord Stormont, a peer of

Septland is the person appointed. It is this which makes it an indignant act; and yet this nobleman, and this indignity and sacrifice, as the North Briton names them, had long since been committed by the late king, when he sent him ambassador to the court of Poland; which act of indignity was neither complained of nor revoked during the administration of Mr. Pitt. On what account does the same act become so ignominious in his present majesty which was so blameless in the late? Or, wherefore was it necessary to conceal the knowledge of it, by not inserting it "in the Gazette?" It is on the word Scottish, and not on the fact which your darling relies, to communicate a further venom to the minds of those whom he has already poisoned: and perhaps he may at length perceive, that "the house of Murray" may exert its loyalty to the king whom he abuses.

To the above he adds, my lord, "but electoral policy has ever been obsequious to the court of Vienna." Is this designed to suggest, that his majesty prefers the welfare of his Hanoverian to his British subjects; and to excite the same dislike against him on that account, which prevailed against his progenitors? There may be malice but no truth in the design. And obsequious as electoral policy may have been to the court of Vienna, the obsequiousness thereof, in you and your brother, to the court of Prussia has cost this nation a sum incomparably greater than all that has been lavished by former ministers on that of Austria and with as little benefit to this nation.

The next object of your favourite's sarcasm is lord George Sackville. He asks, "was it a tender regard for the honour of the late king, or of his present majesty, that invited to court lord George Sackville in these first days of peace, to share in the general satisfaction which all good courtiers received in the indignity offered to lord Ligonier, and on the advancement of——?" of his late Majesty I will say no more than, Peace be to his manes. Of the present I will venture to aver, if that nobleman be called to court, it is to efface the injury which was done him in your adminis-

tration. It proceeds from that justice which is the delight of our sovereign, who sees things as they really exist; who mourns the violation of that celestial attribute in others, and repairs the breach, as far as it is possible. Read the trial of lord George Sackville with eyes unprejudiced, and you must allow his recall to be just. I could a tale unfold, my lord, concerning the treatment of that nobleman, that would probably embarrass the countenances even of you and of your stepbrother; and some future occasion may be found for it. At present I shall only desire you would call to mind the vehemence with which he was pursued, and that with all that energy of power which was exerted, the court-martial could be induced alone to confirm his dismissal from service; a sentence, not improbably pronounced in complaisance to him who had dismissed him, rather than in obedience to a conviction of his criminality. A sentence which, in fact, adding nothing to the state to which he had been previously reduced, can hardly be called a condemnation of his conduct.

But you, my lord, are right in patronizing the writer who strives to continue the efforts of popular prejudice against him. You know the day may come, when all that futile rant, false metaphor, and turgid phrase of your brother's oratory, may be opposed by the uniformity of composition, force of argument, and propriety of expression of lord George; and that nothing but a maddening multitude can countenance the former, or depress the latter.

Dauntless as your favourite may appear, yet has he afforded one instance of fear or cunning. Of modesty it cannot be, by him who has outraged royalty itself. He has concluded the above sentence with a ----- without mentioning the person, Lord Granby, who has succeeded to Lord Ligonier, is the only man who can, with propriety, be placed therein: even he, the soldiers and the nation's darling, in whom humanity and valour contend for the ascendancy, is tacitly designed, to heighten the indignity which, he says, is offered to Lord Ligonier; a man whose services and talents have

received the full reward of their deserts; whose age renders him improper for that post, and whose resignation has been attended with greater marks of honour. Are these the tokens of indignity offered to him?

In this sarcasm of recalling lord George to court, your decent author reflects directly on his king. When he "asks" was this to shew *princely* gratitude, to the eminent services of the accomplished general, of the house of Brunswic; who had so great a share in rescuing "Europe from the yoke of France." Ingratitude my lord is a vice unknown to our present *prince*, and that general has no reason to complain thereof from England. Smile he must at the precipitate remuneration of your sanguine brother, who sent him the garter, and twenty thousand pounds for the acquisition of a conquest, which the most prejudiced must allow was not owing to his generalship. It was the treachery of Broglio, the bravery of a few English troops, unknown to him, and the spirit of lord Downe, in the moment of action, and in the face of danger, to which we are indebted for that victory, in consequence of which Prince Ferdinand received that conspicuous reward, and lord George that unmerited censure.

Whatever yoke might have been by France laid on Europe, but for that battle; is the rescue from it to be placed to the account of a general who was surprized by the enemy, and who had been defeated but for the causes above mentioned?

The predilection of Germans is at an end, my lord the claims of mercy and of justice, are now open to Englishmen, and so they will continue unless your favourite, and men like him persisting to inflame the multitude against their sovereign, create an esteem in him for continental subjects, who, animated by motives of reason, are loyal and obedient. Think my lord on the fatal consequences of alienating a sovereign's love from the subjects of this island: that love which we have long implored, and shall now enjoy, if furious ambition excite and direct not the insanity of the people.

Having advanced thus far, your minion asks "is it
 "sant to assert the honour of the crown, only against
 "the united wishes of a loyal and affectionate people
 "founded in a happy experience of the talents, ability,
 "integrity, and virtue, of those who have had the glo-
 "ry of redeeming their country from bondage and ruin,
 "in order to support by every art of corruption and
 "intimidation, a weak, disjointed, incapable set of — I
 "will call them any thing but ministers, — By whom
 "the favourite still meditates to rule this kingdom with
 "a rod of iron."

No crown my lord can receive greater honour than by
 doing justice to the injured, and the loyalty and affection
 of the people, will encrease in proportion as that justice
 is expanded. But it seems this loyalty and affection are
 founded, according to the expression of your favourite,
 not on the virtues of the king, but on those which he has
 attributed to you and your step brother. Let me examine
 into the rectitude of thus ascribing such excellence to
 you. Was your *ability* manifested in planing these ex-
 peditions where the *force* was insufficient to the *design*.
 In the fruitless expensive armaments which were sent on
 the coasts of France and Belleisle? Fruitless I mean in ad-
 vantages to this kingdom. Was your *integrity* manifest-
 ed in adopting all you had condemned, and stripping
England for the sake of *German* interests? Was your *vir-*
tue manifested, or our *Redemption* obtained, by adding
 eighty millions of money to the debt already contracted?
 Is our *bondage* lessened by being mortgaged to labour fif-
 teen hours out of twenty, to obtain wherewithal to pay
 the interest of those debts? Is our *ruin* protracted by
 this acceleration of the cause thereof? What *art* of cor-
 ruption has been added to this which has not been prac-
 tised by the ministers of preceeding reigns? And I be-
 lieve my lord, that you will find his majesty and his
 ministers *firm*, *united*, and *capable* of opposing the male-
 volence, insidiousness, and machinations of your favour-
 ite, and of all who ungratefully support him. And this
 I will aver, that whatever that nobleman may meditate
 whom he calls the favourite, the noble persons whom he
 has named his tools, will follow no other meditations

but those which tend to the honour of his majesty, the freedom and felicity of the people; and that the iron rod of your reign is completely broken. In this manner my lord have I gone thro' the examination of the forty fifth number of the North Briton, all of which are open to the same castigation, not even that excepted which you are supposed to have written; and from the whole of it, what connection does there appear between the name of Wilkes and Liberty? Or, what has his discharge in common with the idea of national freedom, that the multitude should rejoice thereat? Those members of both houses who prefer licentiousness to liberty may, indeed, rejoice to see that so long a list of transgressions, with impunity, is now added to their privilege; and the people may be induced to lament it.

Give me leave, my lord, to observe one more inconsistency with which your favourite is endowed. He applauds, and justly, the behaviour of serjeant Glyn in his behalf. It is a circumstance that will redound eternal honour to that gentleman, that he afforded your author that assistance to which every Englishman is intitled; as it is an ignominy that should for ever rest on all serjeants who have betrayed their clients in similar cases. Such, instead of being honoured with the name of king's serjeants, should be branded on the forehead with G. R. in order to mark them, and prevent others from being deceived; but such fronts are not susceptible of impression. And yet he has, in a former paper, slandered Sir John Philips for exerting that assistance in favour of Mr. Murray, whose cause was at least as much the cause of national liberty as that of Mr. Wilkes. A circumstance which must condemn the advocate he would praise; or the praise which he has bestowed on him, must alike belong to the other whom he has abused.

May I presume to advise your lordship? Repent, my lord, and give some tokens of repentance for your late conspicuous patronage of the North Briton. You have sacrificed too much to the vindictive gods of the Saxons, which are placed in your gardens. If you will not re-

pent, snatch your own and brother's bust from the temple of friendship, and bury them beneath the ruins of the fane of modern Virtue. If they contain the same prolific principles which you possess, they will prove the most fertilizing manure for the thorns and brambles which grow around it. But I rather wish, my lord, that you would attentively observe the epitaph in your gardens, inscribed by your predecessor to Signior Fido, an Italian greyhound, wherein it is said,

" He hunted not after fame ;

" Respected the laws of society,

" And died an honour and example to the whole
" species."

I am, my Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient,

and most humble Servant,

POSTSCRIPT.

Be pleased, my lord, to present my best respects to your favourite, and be so good as to acquaint him, that I am suspicious, he has been no less egregiously taken in by the person who sent him a copy of a common soldier's discharge, by W. Ellis, Esq; than the Auditor was by the account of the Florida turf: at least, whether this intelligence was sent designedly to dupe him or not, he has thereby duped himself, or intended to dupe his readers.

“ By the right honourable Welbore Ellis, his
majesty's secretary at War.

“ Having received his *majesty's commands*, do hereby
“ by discharge Anthony Nicholas, a private man, from
“ the Coldstream regiment of foot guards, command-
“ ed by general James lord Tyrawley, from any further
“ service in the said regiment.

“ *To all his Majesty's*
“ *officers, civil and mi-*
“ *litary, whom it may*
“ *concern.*”

Given under my hand and
seal at the war office, this 26th
day of March, 1763.

W. ELLIS.

As a proof of the illegality of the above discharge,
the following article of war is adduced.

“ Art. of War, Sect. 3. Art. 2. After a non-com-
“ missioned officer or soldier, shall have been duly en-

" lifted, and sworn, he shall not be dismissed ~~our~~ service, without a discharge in writing, and no discharge granted to him shall be allowed of as sufficient, which is not signed by a field officer of the regiment into which he was enlisted, or commanding officer, where no field officer of the regiment is in Great Britain.

" *Query.* Is the secretary of war a field officer?
" Or what officer is he?

My Queries.

1. Did his majesty exclude himself from discharging a common man by this article of war, saving on the above conditions?

2. If he did, has he not excluded himself from the power of reducing and disbanding his troops, but by the consent of the above officer?

3. Can not then the field officers according to his opinion, keep the army from being reduced or disbanded, respecting the non-commissioned officers and private men in contradiction to his majesty's commands?

4. If his majesty should break the whole number of field officers, would not he be incapacitated from dismissing the private men?

5. Was not this Nicholas discharged by his majesty's command?

6. Is not the secretary at war the proper officer to signify such commands.

7. Did not the North Briton, who by his department in command, was endeared to the whole corps, in stating his single quere, as much forget that the discharge was made by the *king's commands*, as the Auditor, that there were no chimnies in the American islands to burn turt in.

8. Have you, my Lord, and Mr. Wilkes any doubt of the legality of your being discharged from the king's service by his *majesty's command*, signified by the secretary of state?

1. Did his majesty exclude himself from discharging a common man by this article of war, being on the above conditions?

2. If he did, was he not excluded himself from the power of releasing and discharging his troops, but by the contents of the above article?

3. Can he, the King, be said to have excluded himself from the power of releasing and discharging his troops, but by the contents of the above article?

4. If his majesty excluded himself from the power of releasing and discharging his troops, but by the contents of the above article?

5. Was not the King's majesty discharged by his majesty's command?

6. Is not the King's majesty discharged by his majesty's command?



